Issue 16 June 18th 2015

Vive Charlie!

Weekly Online Satire Magazine in Tribute to

Charlie Hebdo



REST IN PEACE

Stephane Charbonnier
Jean Cabut
Bernard Verlhac
Georges Wolinski
Philippe Honore
Elsa Cayat
Bernard Maris
Michel Renaud
Mustapha Ourrad
Ahmed Merabet
Frederic Boisseau
Franck Brinsolaro

Welcome to Vive Charlie the free online satirical magazine created in the wake of the horrific terrorist attack at the offices of Charlie Hebdo in Paris.

If you are reading this, then you are probably one of the many that has supported this project by making pledges through our Patreon page and for that we thank you. Without your support this project would not be possible; as the time, resources, commitment and costs required to deliver Vive Charlie would be out of reach.

In a very short space of time we have assembled a professional, creative and dedicated team. We already have artists, satirists, administrators, columnists, comedians, authors, publishers, lawyers, translators and web development specialists that have agreed to give their time and expertise freely to get Vive Charlie up and running.

The money pledged has allowed us to purchase a web domain, email servers, equipment, software and materials. Until such time that the monthly pledges via Patreon reach $4,000 we will be running at a financial loss. We would therefore encourage you to share our work on social media, with friends, and family. Please be assured that Vive Charlie has not been set up as a profit making project. 20% of all profits will be donated each month to a charitable cause, selected by you, our Patrons. The remainder of the profits will be invested in Vive Charlie, to ensure it remains advertising free, to expand our reach by promoting it online and to increase the content.

If you have not already signed up as a Patron and would like to, click this link. You can pledge as little as $1 a month, that's just 25 cents an issue. Pledging is easy and can be anonymous, you can pay by direct debit, Paypal or debit/credit card and can cancel at anytime.

As already stated Vive Charlie will focus on promoting freedom of speech and freedom of expression through satire. Rest assured we are not left or right leaning, nor are we West or East leaning. Anyone and anything that is an affront to normal sensibilities is a target, whether it be overly politically correct media outlets, politicians, world leaders, religion, celebrities, sports stars or current events.

We would also like to extend on open invitation to you, our Patrons, to submit your ideas, focus areas, subjects and people that you feel deserve to be mocked, ridiculed, offended or shamed into action.

Once again, thank you for your generous support and enjoy issue 16 of Vive Charlie.

Old Holborn

There are 60million of us but only 646 of them

Britain's Vilest Troll - Daily Mail. Award winning Columnist, Satirist, Libertarian legend. Champion of Free Speech and a Free Society.

The insufferable inequali

Where do we start this week? Charlotte Church? Rachel Dolezal? Tim Hunt? Peter Tatchell?

I'm trying to put a coherent column together and all I see around me is utter insanity and full moonbat fuckwittery as the "progressive" left pulls itself apart in a desperate attempt to include everyone it likes as "respected valued individuals" whilst assimilating them all into the great collective. Identity politics is pulling itself apart as black women who aren't black and white women who aren't actually women scream and scream until they are blue in the face that they are the most important people on the planet and we should all bow to their wishes.

Peter Tatchell, once a respected political activist, has decided that he actually owns the London Pride parade and can decide who may attend and woe betide you if you're the wrong flavour gay or want to leave the EU- as Orwell said (God, I'm quoting him every week) – "All animals are equal but some are more equal than others". Best of luck with that, Peter, you've developed a Napoleon complex and look what happened to him.

Except of course, we aren't all equal, are we? There's a reason Usain Bolt can run faster than any white man on the planet and there's a reason Indian and Jewish scientists and mathematicians are currently heading up research and development departments all over the globe. It's in the genes and there's nothing anyone can do about it – short of the state eugenic breeding programmes so beloved of the authoritarian regimes of the last century.

Try telling that to any member of the collective, and as Tim Hunt just found out, you'll be hounded to an assisted suicide by a baying mob who would have us all dressed in Mao suits and toiling the fields in an instant. No matter that a Nobel Prize winning research scientist actually spotted that women are more sensitive and might burst in to tears and have a tantrum occasionally, mention it in public and... you guessed it... they'll burst into tears and have a tantrum – the result is now that a leading cancer specialist has decided to quit and devote his time (along with his scientist wife) to gardening instead of finding cures for cancers. Stupidity 1 – Common sense and logic 0. As usual.

The left have trapped themselves in a very tight corner. They can't admit that identity politics is a pile of crap designed to force "equality" upon us all without accepting that we are all individuals with free will who really ought to be allowed to do as we damn well please – including calling ourselves African Americans if it suits us. But it's great fun watching them demanding the right for Stan (Loretta) to have babies even if he doesn't have a womb – once again, life imitates Art (copyright – Peoples Front of Judea).

Me? I'm happy to take people as I find them. Most I detest (obviously) but that's my business and the last thing I actually want is a planet full of Old Holborns. I enjoy the diversity of 7 billion individuals all happily doing their own thing – it's when they gang up and demand everyone be like them that the trouble starts. Live and let live as the saying goes – yet it never actually does. From the baying mobs on Twitter demanding that Kay Burley be burned at the stake instead of simply just not watching Sky News to the self appointed moral guardians (in the name of Allah or a

demanding that Kay Burley be burned at the stake instead of simply just not watching Sky News to the self appointed moral guardians (in the name of Allah or a Malaysian mountain) every bastard wants you to conform to their perfect ideal.

Well, there is no perfect ideal. There is no utopia where the Offendotrons can run to and live perfect collective lives in blissful ignorance. Every single place it has been tried ended up in death camps, misery, war and poverty.

We are born to be free thinking individuals with free will. The sooner each and every one of us learns to simply stop trying to inflict our views, without consent, on others, the sooner we can get back to living the one life we get in peace. Do something for the future – stop trying to tell other people how to live their lives and start living your own, how you see fit. We aren't the same, we don't all want the same and we don't all think the same. It's why we're the most successful species on the planet (after blood sucking mosquitoes, obviously). Now about those parasitic politicians and their taxes...

ty of "Identity Politics"



ISIS bans pigeon breeding

Vive Charlie TV

ISIS bans pigeon breeding as seeing birds' genitals 'offends Islam'	All-female team to bite, pinch women not wearing veils
Kurds Seize Key Syrian Town From IS Militants	Morsi Jailed For Spying As Death Sentence Upheld
Al Qaeda's Leader In Yemen Killed In Airstrike	Obese motorist who killed a jogger asks to be spared jail - because she's TOO FAT
Ex-FIFA Executive Blazer Worked Undercover	Man has sex with wife's dog because she was paying it too much attention
Two Canadian Cities Have Banned Mermaids from Public Pools	Chris Evans combing through giant address book of knobheads

School lunchbox diktats really take the biscuit

by Mark Sparrow

© Mark Sparrow 2015

Journalist, photographer and broadcaster. Tech writer @Forbes. Presenter of C4's Dispatches: 'Truth About Hospital Food'. Author of 'Notes From A Hospital Bed'. Mark uses Twitter to debate and discuss issues at @markgsparrow.

It's time we stood up to petty functionaries and told them to mind their own business when it comes to how we raise our children.

Obedience to the state is taught at an increasingly younger age these days. Children as young as three months are deposited with government-approved nurseries or carers and the things they learn are mandated and inspected by the state until they reach their early twenties and exit full-time education. Arguably the state has a far bigger influence on young minds than the parents who created those young lives. It's no surprise really when the state spends around £10,000 each year subsidising children via education, healthcare, child benefit and working tax credits. It's no wonder the gnomes of Westminster are jostling for more influence on how the tax-paying drones of the future are raised.

Of course, there have always been tussles between parents and schools over things like uniform, punctuality and discipline, but until recently schools rarely contradicted parents or interfered with home life. There has always been a tacit agreement that parents don't tell teachers how to do their job and teachers don't tell parents how to bring up their kids. Well, that's actually starting to change. For example, in Scotland each child now has a state appointed guardian that can, if push comes to shove, overrule the parents if the child's wellbeing is considered to be at risk. And what sort of things do we consider to be risky? The contents of the child's lunchbox?

That's right. Schools are now mandating what children may eat at school by introducing healthy eating policies that not only apply to the school meals that parents can pay for, but now also the contents of lunchboxes as prepared by children's parents' each day. The government is now dictating what parents already started to weigh and measure children as part of the war on obesity but dictating food? This is a gross breach of parental sovereignty and should be viewed with deep suspicion.

The subject of food policing has been in the news this week when children from Cherry Tree Primary School, Colchester, had food removed from their lunchboxes for contravening the school's health eating diktat. One child had her scotch egg confiscated while another had her Pepperami salami sausage commandeered. The foods were removed before the children could eat them and a note was placed in the lunchbox informing parents that the contents of the lunchboxes had failed to pass inspection by whichever semi-educated gauleiter was on lunchbox-snooping duty that lunchtime.

The foods were returned to the children at the end of the day. I hope the scotch egg and sausage had been properly stored at a low temperature or else the ravenous children may have eaten the food on their way home and been struck down with ecoli or salmonella. I also hope that the inspectors used gloves to handle the food and were sufficiently trained in food handling and safety.

The parents involved in this outrageous power grab by the SS dinner ladies were quite rightly incandescent with rage that the food choices they had made for their children were being countermanded by a government functionary. It's deeply rude to undermine a loving parent in front of a child while the parent is absent. It can adversely affect a child when an authority figure implies criticism against a parent and almost tells a child that their parent is wishing harm upon them.

I should point out that the two children who fell foul of this ridiculous policy had yogurt, sandwiches and fruit in their lunchbox, alongside the sausage treats. It's not as if they'd been sent to school with a sugar sandwich and nothing else. And who is to decide what is healthy? Had some children from a loving immigrant family from the Indian sub-continent sent their children to school with some delicious home-made onion bajis, pakoras or samosas, would the canteen commandants have confiscated those? I think you and I know the answer to that one, dear reader. Of course they wouldn't. Out of cultural sensitivity the inspectors would have assumed that the food was wholesome, delicious and in keeping with the parents' cultural values. On the other hand, scotch eggs and salami are not in keeping with anyone's values and are seen as chav fodder and ripe for confiscation despite the fact they were originally an invention of Fortnum & Mason, purveyors of the finest food to Britain's aristocracy since 1707.

The double standards here are so obvious as to be outrageous. In the meantime, the school insists that its own provided meals are in line with government nutritional guidelines. The government-approved nosh includes sweet cakes and cookies. So, food from home is bad and requires inspection but government-approved mass-catered Jamie Oliver junk is ok? Of course, you'd think that the pea-brained functionary on lunchbox duty would have the wit to discern and interpret with a certain amount of common sense... but 'rules is rules, comrade. I was only following orders'.

And in a totally unrelated case, a judge declared last week that immigrant parents who chastise or are violent towards their children should be treated leniently as physical punishment may well be a cultural norm for them. So, scotch eggs bad, slap round the face good? You really couldn't make this stuff up. How much longer are we going to put up with power-crazed, hi-vis-wearing, Taser-wielding nut jobs, carrying out the diktats of increasingly authoritarian governments who now see parenting as being within their purview and something they can legitimately dictate to parents over?

Soon we will have no agency and will simply be robots existing at the whim of the state. I urge all parents to send their children to school with a scotch egg. It's time we fought back. Let the scotch egg be the symbol of our defiance.

ANTHONY B.LIAR
International Man of Misery


McDonald's
KOSHER
For my next project I am going to be targeting anti-Semitism in Europe, so I am just acclimatising, gathering my thoughts and working on an agenda
McDonald
Kosher

Based on my track record I can confidently predict that by the time I've finished with anti-Semitism in Europe it will be back at the levels of 1940's Nazi Germany

PRIDE AND A LOT OF PREJUDICE

By Katie Hopkins

Twitter: @KTHopkins

Website: katiehopkins.co.uk

"It is important to remember Pride in London aims to be an inclusive event."

I lifted this line from the press statement for the Gay Pride march in London on June 27 - the same press statement that explains why they are rescinding the invitation to UKIP LGBT to attend.

You see, they did invite them. UKIP has a strong LGBT presence and one of its own MEPs in Scotland is gay. But they had to withdraw the invitation because so many members of the LGBT community were outraged.

And this is where it rubs. I don't care who attends Pride in London. I don't care if they are UKIP, Green Party, I don't care if they are SNP - and I hate the SNP.

My mother says: "Hate is a strong word" - which is why I am using it.

What I do care about is when a community that preaches inclusivity and tolerance is suddenly exceptionally intolerant of anyone with an opposing view.

The increasingly intolerant become the arbiters of right and wrong, acceptable and unacceptable. Those putting pressure on Pride in London to make this decision are exactly the type of people who make gross assumptions about me because I do not have the beauty pageant answer for everything.

No, I don't think the NHS should pay for IVF for gay couples. Yes, all diversity officers are lunatics.

But I do cheerlead you every step of the way to be who you want to be, and sod what other people say (including myself)?

Yes, I chuffing do.

When a community doesn't allow alternative voices to be heard, it is no longer a community . It is a mob, where you must conform to be accepted. The mob is a monster.

Pride in London you should be ashamed. You have become the very people you despised.

Your new slogan should be: Fit in or get out.

ASSHOLE of the week

Peter Tatchell

"Inclusive" doesn't include UKIP

WRONG SKINS

When the Rachel Dolezal story broke the mainstream media was so desperate to validate poor Rachel as some kind of victim rather than the fraud she is, they seized upon the excellent @GodfreyElfwick and his “WrongSkin” hashtag.



What colour will Rachel choose for her next job?

Mossad Stole My Brain

with Asghar Bukhari



JIHADIST JOOOO

Freedom of Speech v Political Correctness

by @NonProphetess

Science nerd, skeptic, humanist, craftbeer enthusiast, geeky mom, facetious writer, and aspiring world-changer. Not for the faint of heart.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights contains thirty articles dictating what rights all people are entitled to, including freedoms of speech, expression, thought, and religion. They don't include the right to not be offended or the right to not be criticized, despite what some groups would have the populace believe. There appear the two extremes, on the one hand we have people who think they have a right to not be criticized because they enjoy freedom of expression and on the other we have people who think they have a right to not be offended under the guise of political correctness. Both extremes are wrong.

When asked about his views on gay rights during an interview, potential Presidential Candidate Rand Paul stated gay marriage, "offends myself and a lot of other people," implying that marriage equality should be denied on the basis of giving offense. His suggestion was for civil unions or contracts, reserving marriage as a religious entitlement. He undoubtedly has the right to hold this belief and to express it. What Paul fails to realize is that he doesn't have the right to not be offended. Anything, at one time or another, can offend another person. Women's reproductive rights are offensive to conservative Christians. Obesity can be offensive. Letting children have too much screen time can be offensive. It is the most meaningless position to take on a topic. Opposition to equality on the basis of offense or belief is exactly what the Constitution is designed to prohibit. It is morally reprehensible to assert that one group or person has the prerogative to dictate rights for others.

Moral and intellectual integrity appear to be discarded though when politics are involved. Ex-Labour Party Leader Ed Miliband recently promised to make Islamophobia an "aggravated crime." Islamophobia has been characterized as prejudice toward, hatred, or fear of Islam which would essentially dub Miliband's proposal as introducing Orwellian thought crimes. No ideology, belief, speech, or action is above criticism. When The PEN American Center announced they would bestow their 2015 Freedom of Expression Courage award on Charlie Hebdo, more than 200 writers withdrew from the event. The reason they cited was the claim that equal opportunity offense does not have equal implications, that the Muslim population in France is already marginalized and, "Charlie Hebdo's cartoons of the Prophet must be seen as being intended to cause further humiliation and suffering." That reasoning is the very definition of political correctness. It elevates an ideology above criticism simply because it's only expressed by a few. Any belief system that promotes Female Genital Mutilation (FGM), honor killings, and death for apostasy needs to be criticized. Humankind has an ethical imperative to condemn barbarous acts. Staying silent on the matter doesn't remove oneself from the argument; it is aiding and abetting the oppression.

Religion especially has taken on a veil of protection from criticism. In the aftermath of the Charlie Hebdo attack, Pope Francis advocated for limiting freedom of expression. "If my good friend Dr. Gasparri says a curse word against my mother, he can expect a punch," Francis said, throwing a

pretend punch at Gasparri. "It's normal. You cannot provoke. You cannot insult the faith of others. You cannot make fun of the faith of others." It is that same sentiment that has been used to justify absurdity for years coming from the leader of an organization that protects pedophiles. "Faith" is not a 'get out of jail free' card. Violent responses to slights or insults are completely unacceptable, irrespective of provocation. By stating someone has no control over their reactions, they are abdicating personal responsibility. Children can be taught to control their impulses; it is an intellectually inept adult who refuses.

Freedom of speech cannot simply be protected when people are using it to say nice things or it should be retitled as 'freedom of saccharine speech.' All speech needs to be protected, even racist, sexist, or homophobic speech. The American Civil Liberties Union defends this stance as well, stating:

"Free speech rights are indivisible. Restricting the speech of one group or individual jeopardizes everyone's rights because the same laws or regulations used to silence bigots can be used to silence you. Conversely, laws that defend free speech for bigots can be used to defend the rights of civil rights workers, anti-war protesters, lesbian and gay activists and others fighting for justice."

People cannot address bigotry and hate speech by silencing it just as a Band-Aid would be ineffective for a gunshot wound. The only solution to ignorance is education. Dialogue needs to be promoted across all conflicts if oppression is to truly be a thing of the past. Harmful ideologies don't usually change from within; people don't spontaneously give up prejudice and hatred without having those beliefs criticized first. Ask questions. Offer rational objections. Use evidence. Speak out loudly and frequently against injustice. Create a free market of ideas by recognizing that everyone is entitled to freedom of speech and that speech is never above criticism. This is how people effect change.



SPEECH WARS

Episode thirteen. Moe the Merciless, the leader of the even darker side of the Force, continues his crusade to implement blasphemy laws throughout the galaxy. Although he didn't expect so much help from Emperor Murdoch's evil media empire, he won't look a magical flying gift horse in the mouth and is keen to exploit the situation...


I thought we had a deal? I get my oil baron buddies to give you trillions in petro dollar advertising and you censor the media to appease our delicate sensitivities to make way for blasphemy laws?
I'm doing my best, I've banned cartoons of you in all my papers and TV news stations, but I don't control all of the media
I'm going to have to enforce de facto blasphemy laws in the usual way we spread Islam, through violence
Now don't get all Allan Ackbar on me, these things take time

You guys have not been doing your jobs properly so I want you to go to Europe and strike terror into the hearts of the infidels by either shooting or blowing up a few

Vive Charlie!
TIME
12 50
BOMB
Allan Ackbar, we are avenging our prophet

NEWS
The offices of Vive Charlie have been bombed for drawing cartoons, but we won't show them 'coz some viewers may find them offensive
and because they'll bomb us too
SKY NEWS FLASH
BREAKING NEWS
REPORTS OF AN EXPLOSION AT THE OFFICES OF VIVE CHARLIE


Vive Charlie has been attacked for drawing Moe cartoons and the mainstream media are too cowardly to show them
What's our next move?
The terrorists are winning, they now have de facto blasphemy laws because the media are too cowardly to show pictures of Moe. Vive Charlie has been attacked for drawing Moe
We need to speak to the leader at Vive Charlie and see what he wants to do

Whatever you want to do you have our backing and support, what are your plans?
We're going to launch draw Moe competitions all over the civilised world to show these savages that we will not submit to violent bullies. We are going to ram freedom of expression down their throats and they are going to suck it up and like it

In response to being attacked, Vive Charlie has decided to stick two fingers up to the terrorists, by hosting draw Moe competitions all around the civilised world with the full backing of the Secular Alliance
Vive Charlie TV
with @Alibambi

We need to shut these filthy kafir up, we've bombed them, you've censored them and they're still determined to defy us
Yeah, but, we're the intolerant ones, how's that going to work?
We'll start a media campaign denouncing them as intolerant Islamophobic, racist, bigots
It matters not my young terrorist friend, if we shout it loud enough all the useful idiots, eager to please, will attack them like a pack of wolves


Vive Charlie!
BEHEAD INTOLERANT BIGOTS AND RACISTS
Dhimmi 4 Life
I don't care that I'm supporting fascism because I get to call people racist and bigot
Of course I have, I also signed up under my numerous sock account names and my other identities
I've started a petition on change dot org to prevent criticism of ideas, have you signed up?
Once we've helped destroy freedom of expression and democracy, we'll be gold card holding dhimmis in a fascist theocracy, I can't wait...
The future does not belong to those who slander the prophet of Islam

THE ISLAMOPHOBIA REVOLUTION WILL BE BROUGHT TO YOU BY DIET COKE

Daniel Greenfield, a Shillman Journalism Fellow at the David Horowitz Freedom Center, is a New York writer focusing on radical Islam.

WEBSITE TWITTER

While Americans yawned through another weekend, watching television or playing catch with their kids, the greatest human rights violation in our nation's troubled history took place in the sky above Chicago.

Tahera Ahmad, a Muslim chaplain at Northwestern University who has participated in MSA and ISNA events, and gotten her photo taken with Obama, was denied an unopened Diet Coke.

"Muslim Chaplain Tahera Ahmad Denied Diet Coke," NBC News blared. "I Can't Help But Cry," the CNN headline declaims. "'No Diet Coke for you': Islamophobia at 30000 feet," bleated The Guardian.

"Outrage after United Airlines refuses Muslim woman Diet Coke," the Mirror chimed in.

The Diet Coke crisis was upon us. Islamists called for a boycott of United Airlines and #unitedfortahera became a trending hashtag as random idiots denounced racism and commiserated with the horror of being denied a Diet Coke and pledged not to fly United until they actually need to use their airline miles.

Most of the rest of us would have to lose our legs in an airplane engine to get this much publicity and even if that happened, we would still be stuck crawling across the tarmac while the media eagerly converged on a Muslim passenger who had gotten an Islamophobic eyelash caught in her eye.

But that's Muslim Privilege. It means that your whiny complaints about airline service suddenly become an international incident. A million people complain about airline service, but tag your complaint with #IslamophobiaISREAL, as Tahera Ahmad did, and suddenly your Diet Coke denial is a hate crime.

According to Tahera Ahmad, the flight attendant wanted to open her Diet Coke for her instead of giving her an unopened can. On a scale of hate crimes this is somewhere between 0 and -0.02. About the only person who could possibly complain about it is a celebrity whose color allotment of M&Ms is specified in a rider to their contract or a professional Islamic grievance-monger looking for any excuse to play victim.

And yet Ahmad's Diet Coke tribulation was covered by more media outlets than the Muslim rape of thousands of girls in the UK or the suffering of Yazidi girls in Iraq. Her demand for a Diet Coke was compared to Rosa Parks and her tweet about it was launched with the hashtag #IslamophobiaISREAL.

The Islamophobia revolution will be brought to you by Diet Coke.

The TSA isn't too fond of passengers having closed cans of soda on them. It may have something to do with when a Muslim woman attempted to bring down a China Southern Airlines flight to Beijing using soda cans that she had injected with flammable liquid and dropped in the bathroom trash can.

It's unknown whether they were Diet Coke cans. But what was in them probably tasted like Diet Coke. Tahera Ahmad's Diet Coke crisis is a study in Muslim entitlement. Not just in the scope of it, but in the pettiness of it.

Of all the petty complaints about airline service, hers may be the single pettiest complaint in history. Tahera Ahmad isn't even complaining that she didn't get a soda. She's complaining that she had to endure the filthy impure infidel fingers of the flight attendant groping her Diet Coke can.

And it's equally a study in the media's rush to take her ridiculous soda martyrdom and turn

into it yet another piece of evidence that Muslims in America are oppressed by the Christian Diet Coke patriarchy.

Tahera Ahmad had appeared at an ISNA convention. She had been to the White House and had her photo taken with Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry. Not to mention Tariq Ramadan; an open supporter of terrorism against Americans and other non-Muslims around the world.

Despite being a product of traditionalist Islamic institutions like Al-Azhar, the media was eager to buy into the idea that Tahera Ahmad was a reformist. Her recital of the Koran at an ISNA convention was hailed as a breakthrough without anyone asking how that can be said of reciting a creed that deems women and Muslims to be inferior at a convention for a Muslim Brotherhood front group, one of whose officials has stated, "Islam will prevail over other religions".

On her Twitter account, Tahera Ahmad had retweeted a call to deny an honorary degree to Ayaan Hirsi Ali, a human rights activist who was raised a Muslim, but left Islam after recognizing the violent text of the Koran. Ayaan Hirsi Ali suffered through many challenges. None of them involved a Diet Coke. Instead Ayaan Hirsi Ali had FGM inflicted on her. As an adult, she had to deal with death threats. Her response to them was to continue speaking out. And yet the media prefers the entitled bleating of Tahera Ahmad's Diet Coke crisis to a serious ex-Muslim intellectual who risks her life every day.

Tahera Ahmad's sense of entitlement echoes that of her progressive allies. As feminism has taken a dumpster dive into pettiness and entitlement, it has little room for a woman like Ayaan Hirsi Ali who speaks to them about a world in which women are raped and murdered by Islamic Jihadists. They prefer to instead turn minor inconveniences into micro-aggressions to their swollen egos.

In Ahmad's world, not getting exactly what she wants is a hate crime. And Tahera Ahmad's whining embodies the torrent of petty Muslim complaints about America in microcosm.

Muslims claim that they're the most oppressed group in the country, but so far that oppression isn't reflected in such objective metrics as hate crime statistics or actual incidents of oppression.

The banner Islamophobic hate crimes never seem to pan out either.

Shaima Alawadi was supposedly murdered by a racist American because she wore a hijab. The perpetrator left behind a note on the floor reading, "Go back to your country, you terrorist." A social media campaign complete with hijabis making duckfaces at the camera while holding up signs reading, "I am Shaima" was launched. The campaign had to be scrapped when it turned out that she had been murdered by her Muslim husband. But it did give "I am Shaima" a new authentic meaning.

The Chapel Hill shootings turned out to be just a parking dispute no matter how desperately Islamist groups and their lefty accomplices tried to turn the perpetrator's atheism into evidence of a hate crime.

There isn't a single fatal anti-Muslim hate crime on record. Islamophobia has never killed anyone. The average anti-Muslim hate crime is committed by other Muslims.

What's a good Islamist to do? Try to spin complaints about airline service into oppression. No one likes air travel, especially since Muslim terrorism inflicted the humiliating regimen of the TSA on the entire country. But Muslim complaints about it get a unique hearing because of their Muslim privilege.

Islamophobia is a self-reinforcing myth. The Americans groped at TSA checkpoints aren't victims, but when a Muslim who has had a photo taken with Obama can't get her Diet Coke the way she wants it, then it's the worst soft-drink related human rights incident since Gitmo stopped serving Crystal Pepsi.

Muslim oppression of non-Muslims requires a narrative of victimhood to grease the wheels. So does leftist subversion of America under the guise of aiding the oppressed. And if that victimhood sometimes has to be found at the bottom of an unopened can of Diet Coke, that's the fizz of the Jihad.

Hugh Jasshole

Chairman of the International Useful Idiots Council













Idiots Gallery

"ARE ZIONISTS TRYING TO INTIMIDATE ME:
Someone came into my home yesterday, while I was asleep. I dont know how they got in, but they didn't break in - the only thing they took was a single shoe - they left one shoe behind to let me know someone had been there.

Of course I cant prove anything and thats part of the intimidation. The game is simple - to make me feel vulnerable in my own home. Its Psychological. Neither can I do much about it.

It is not the I have heard this happening. I had another Muslim leader call me a year or so ago, in tears - she told me they had been coming into her house and re-arranging things - just to let her know they had been there.

There is one good thing that comes out of all oppression however - for those who are smart - from my misfortune, others can learn how they operate. Share this widely, for if it is happening to me, I am sure it happening to many, many others who have not exposed it."

Stand Up for Islam with Bernard Hamza

@causticbob has a wonderful habit of offending everyone.

Whether you're black, white, yellow or brown. Male, female, gay, left wing, right wing, racist or stupid; You're a target...

Hillary 2017

The year is 2017 and Hillary Clinton is now president and she is spending her first night in the East Room of the Whitehouse. The East Room is widely rumored to be haunted by past presidents of the United States. Hillary doesn't believe this nonsense and climbs into bed for a long winter's sleep. The clock strikes midnight and Hillary wakens with a start and who does she see but the spectre of the first president, George Washington.

Only mildly shocked by Washington's presence hovering over her she asks, "George. May I call you George? What advice can you give me to be the best president I can possibly be?".

Washington, in a very stately, ethereal tone answers her, "Mrs Clinton, live your life as I have, never tell a lie". And then the first president disappears. "Damn" thinks Hillary as she drifts off to sleep. As the clock strikes one, Hillary is again awoken as the spirit of James Madison appears and she asks of him the same question.

President Madison advises her, "Mrs Clinton, do as I have always done, fight for a smaller, less intrusive government where personal liberty is important" and then disappears to join his fellow deceased presidents.

"More bad advice" Hillary curses then falls back asleep. Time passes and the clock strikes two. This time the apparition of Abraham Lincoln appears. She asks of him "Honest Abe, I have been visited by presidents this evening and have asked each of them how I can be a better president. None have given me advice that I can follow. Please, Mr. President, tell me what I can do to best serve this great country".

President Lincoln looks Hillary straight in the eyes, and, as was his way, was brief and straight to the point. "Go to the theater".

SOCIAL JUSTICE Warriors





SOCIAL JUSTICE Warriors

Like British Rail snow – the 'wrong' sort of Victims

There is no surer way to forget your own troubles than to listen to those of others.

On Saturday, I sat and listened to the stories pour out of individuals who have suffered from the hideous process sometimes lightly dismissed as 'being the subject of a false allegation of sexual misconduct'.

Believe it or not, there are those in our society who consider it a travesty that these people should even be allowed to congregate in public along with academics studying the way the legal system works to try to ensure fairness and justice for all.

We were advised that extra security had been laid on by the university, warned that activists were planning to disrupt the conference. Activists who insist that anything less than 'total belief' for each and every allegation of sexual misconduct – even where a trial has taken place and the defendant found not guilty – is adhered to, then 'children will suffer'.

So, to be clear, I am not talking about a meeting of paedophiles or their supporters – I am talking about a meeting of men and women who have always been totally innocent, have been found to be totally innocent by a jury of their peers, and remain totally innocent, of carrying out sexual abuse – but still there are those in society who feel that they do not have the right to free speech.

Estimates of false allegations range from 2 – 10%. For the sake of fairness, I shall work on a figure of 5%.

There is a problem even with that low estimate, for it is little known that to be charged with 'wasting police time' – a more common, and considerably more lenient charge than 'perverting the course of justice' – the false allegator must be charged within six months of the original accusation, not six months from when the accusation was found to be false. Unlikely to happen when it is common for 12 – 18 months to elapse between original accusation and a charging decision regarding the defendant!

There is a further problem in that the accuser remains anonymous, so the possibility of 'corroboration by volume' which has seen to so many public figures charged with historic abuse after much publicity, cannot be applied to tip the balance into 'likelihood of successful prosecution' that determines whether the CPS will take action against a false allegator. The case must stand or fall on whether other evidence had been fabricated or created to support the false allegation and/or whether the complaint was malicious – even whether it is 'in the public interest' to so prosecute, particularly when so many of the allegators have been found to be mentally ill.

Quite amazing that my fairness based '5%' of false allegations ever manage to surmount these obstacles.

That 5% means that of the 1433 individuals currently being hosed down by Operation Hydrant, the latest historic abuse multi-disciplinary inquiry, we can confidently state that at least 71 of those individuals will suffer the indignities, stress, and financial penalties that were so eloquently described on Saturday.

I made a list of their main points of contention; lets go through them one by one. Starting with their first point of contact with our justice system.

The dawn raid. It is perfectly reasonable, when you are faced with a dangerous and possibly armed gangster, that a) you strike when they are half awake at 5am, b) you go in mob handed, ready to deal with a steroid infused bank robber who has already proved himself capable of dealing a lethal blow to some unfortunate security guard. It is not reasonable when you are dealing with a 72 year old man who is accused of having ogled a schoolboy in a shower 40 years ago. Yet they still do just that – part of the theatre of policing.

The house search. It is perfectly reasonable, when you are conducting a major investigation, to search the house with a tooth comb. Removing computers and incriminating material is understandable. Removing, as I heard in one case involving a man accused of raping a 17 year old – 35 years ago – the teddy bear belonging to his 50 year old female tenant, in case it showed evidence of 'grooming a child' is not. Neither is so efficiently removing every scrap of paper in the house, that you are left with no contact telephone numbers. Diaries, letters from past lovers, even Christmas cards vanish, not to be seen again for many months. It leaves people feeling they have been personally violated. Total strangers are going to trawl through every last detail of their life – not merely (in the case of teaching staff) from their career, where they might have offended – but the poetry they have written in retirement and never shown anyone, the recriminatory letters to their family intended to be opened after death. Take a look around your own home; tell me you don't own some greying underwear, or have carefully secreted that letter from an old flame 56 years ago, or quietly nipped into Boots to buy a tube of something helpful without telling the world that you suffered from an itchy bum. We all have secrets we would prefer to keep to ourselves – but you have no secrets when you are the subject of a full scale house search. You have become public property. Your partner, your children, the neighbours, all are witnessing this public spectacle – part of the theatre of policing.

Finally you are taken away in a police car. Exactly the same way that drug dealers are removed from our streets, murderers transported to jail, fraudsters removed from polite society. Of course the neighbours will be watching again, and speculating. Your partner and children will just have to deal with the speculation as best they can.

After several hours in a vomit stained police cell, bereft of your shoes and belt, with a Styrofoam cup of tea if you are lucky, you may find that those policemen that were so keen to start work at 5am have finally worked up the enthusiasm to interview you. You may even have the company of a recently qualified young whippersnapper of a duty solicitor to advise you to reply 'no comment' to any questions until you understand fully what you are suspected of.

Now, cast your mind back 33 years, between 31st January 1982 and December 31st 1985, (we have what are called 'representative charges' these days, so no use thinking that someone is accusing you of molesting them on April 21st 1984 when you know damn well you were on a cruise to celebrate your tenth wedding anniversary) you are being asked whether you ever had physical contact with a boy called Joe at any time over a three year period! Well – did you? How many boys called Joe have you taught in your time? You worked at three different schools over that three year period; how many 'Joe's' in each?

Nobody is telling you exactly what the allegations are at this stage, so whilst you may know perfectly well that you have never in your life had sexual relations with any male, child or not – is that what they are talking about? Inappropriate behaviour – what the Hell does that mean?

Eventually, after many months of stressful interviews, you may still find yourself charged. If you do, you will be placed in the dock, surrounded by bullet proof glass like a caged animal. Fair enough, it is designed to stop the proverbial steroid crazed gangster from leaping over the barrier and grabbing the judge by the throat – but it is still there for our 72 year old teacher; giving the impression that he is a dangerous animal before the case even starts.

Other impressions are being foisted onto the jury too, before a word is spoken. For the 'allegator' referred to as 'victim' in line with national policy, (thankfully the courts haven't progressed to 'survivor' yet!) although now a 48 year old Karate trainer, or maybe a burly matron

with a fake tan and a fish wives mouth – has taken advantage of the facility granted to six year old children bravely giving evidence against their father of child abuse – and is protected by a screen; 'so frightened' of you all these years later. No longer police theatre – now it's court room theatre.

One unfortunate man got to this point in the proceedings, accused of molesting boys (plural) in the showers after he taken them for PE lessons – before the jury took note of the fact that he was their maths teacher, and had never set foot in the showers, nor taken them for PE.

The jury cleared him in record time, as they did another fellow who was accused by a boy – and was able to prove that when he was at the school, the boy was 22 and had long since left. They had never met each other! Others have committed suicide, unable to take the stress. Needless to say, they go down in history as 'guilty men'. We will never know.

You might imagine that these anomalies would be sorted out before a court case – but 'it ain't necessarily so'. The victim's – or survivors, as they prefer – 'must be believed'. They must, in the words of Chief Inspector Bailey, in charge of Operation Hydrant, be given more funds for 'support'.

"The government has allocated millions of pounds to provide additional support, but I am not sure that is going to be enough. We are talking about hundreds of thousands of victims,"

In fact, Chief Inspector Bailey estimates that:

"This year I am anticipating an estimated 116,000 reports of child sexual abuse will be received, that is a 71% increase since 2012, so it gives you some idea of the scale of this. 52,446 are allegations of sexual abuse in the past, some involving cases going back decades."

So by my 5% of 'false allegations' – 2,620 totally innocent individuals will go through this process, and for them, there will be no support beyond the FACT organisation.

They will fund their own defence, they will use up their pensions paying solicitors privately. The cost of this will not be refunded when they are found to be innocent. They will deal with the fall out within their own family, the stress that can take marriages to breaking point, or alcohol consumption to lethal levels. Their children will be bullied at schools. Neighbours will look askance at them, for surely there is no smoke without fire?

Their lives will be ruined, wrecked. They will lose all faith in the police and the criminal justice system.

One day, they will be handed back a polythene bag with their diaries, and mobile phones, the love letter they kept from 56 years ago, and the poetry they wrote.

They were the lucky ones.

Others will find that juries have been so comprehensively groomed by the media that they believe a victim's evidence is infallible – and they will have convicted them; sentenced to spend 10, 20 years in prison.

Should they try to appeal, they will find that an appeal will not be allowed 'unless they have fresh evidence' – fresh evidence in cases that never had any evidence beyond 'she said'? Or 'he said'?

Should they gather on a damp and dark May day in blustery Cardiff to support each other, to tell their tales of woe, to inquire of academics 'what can be done to lessen the chances of this continuing to happen'? – they will find that they require enhanced security in the university to allow them to do so.

Because giving all 'victims a voice' will never do, will it? Free speech is for the army of middle aged malcontents, nightly appearing on Sky news with fantastical tales – not for these victims.

You can support the FACT organisation by BACS payment to: Santander Account 98614484 Sort Code 090154. Or PAFAA, the organisation for those who have been falsely accused by a family member.

They may be all the support you will find, should it be your turn to be falsely accused one day.

Recommended Reading



Oxford's new feminist hit squad By Damian Thompson

This year a group of undergraduates — mostly women — will be shunning parties. They will be staying in their college rooms, fingers flying across their keyboards as they scowl at the screen.

Ipso: a great new way for bullies to muzzle the press
By James Delingpole

By the time complaints are rejected, the damage is done: journalists are fined days of work for voicing unpopular opinions.

The Pecking Disorder: Social Justice Warriors Gone Wild
By Cathy Young

Culture wars over "social justice" have been wreaking havoc in many communities, including universities and science fiction fandom.

Why Do Feminists cook up stories about 'misogyny' when they lose debates? By Milo Yiannopoulos

One of the most frustrating things about debating feminists and feminist academics is how readily they reach for words such as “abuse,” “harassment” and “safety” – particularly, it seems, when they are losing the argument.

Videos of the week

Pat Condell - There's no racist like a liberal racist

Website: www.patcondell.net Twitter: @patcondell

Jokes About ISIS Are Not Funny

Apparently the PC brigade thinks that ISIS is not a suitable subject for satire...

Islamophobia

An original argument constructed to counter a concept.

Concept: Criticizing Islam is a form of bigotry.

Noisykafir's BURKAPAPA #16

RAMADAN LUNCH MENU

18th June - 17th July

Starters

Main Courses

Desserts

FREE RAIF BADAWI

Raif is not a criminal – he is a prisoner of conscience who called for free speech on his website. His treatment by authorities in Saudi Arabia has been nothing short of a vicious act of cruelty.

Raif was arrested in June 2012. In May 2014 he was found guilty of breaking Saudi Arabia's strict technology laws and insulting Islamic religious figures by creating and managing an online forum.

He was sentenced to 10 years in prison, 1,000 lashes, a fine of 1 million Saudi Riyal (over a quarter of a million US dollars), and prevented from using any kind of media or travelling until 2034.

Raif's sentence stems from his creation of the website 'Saudi Arabian Liberals', which he envisaged as a forum for political and social debate. He was subsequently charged for content he had posted to the site, including an article published on Valentine's Day 2012 in which he was accused of ridiculing Saudi Arabia's religious police, the Commission on the Promotion of Virtue and Prevention of Vice – as well as failing to remove 'offensive' posts by other contributors.

Aseem Trivedi is an independent cartoonist and free speech activist from New Delhi, India. He is creating a cartoon for each of the 50 lashes Raif Badawi has received. Above is number 22 in his series of 50. Vive Charlie will be featuring his cartoons each week so please follow him on Twitter.
@aseem_trivedi



"IT WON'T STOP WITH ME" - PAMELA GELLER ON BEING TARGETED BY ISIS FOR ASSASSINATION.

Originally published in BREITBART

Pamela Geller is the President of the American Freedom Defense Initiative (AFDI) and publisher of PamelaGeller.com.

Website **Twitter**

Now that it has come to light that Boston jihadis Usaama Rahim and Dawud Sharif Abdul Khaliq were plotting to behead me, the mainstream media is in full panic mode, trying to deny the plot against me and downplay its significance.

The media wants to make it all about Pamela Geller - "controversial," "provocative," "inciteful" - as if they think that if they get rid of me, they are rid of the problem. The media has been avoiding reality since 9/11, and now we are suffering the consequences of their avoiding reality. There is a problem in Islam with or without Pamela Geller. By virtue of this jihadist murder plot against me, I have become the proxy for every freedom-loving American who refuses to submit to violent intimidation.

I am the Islamic State's target because I am, unlike most of the mainstream media, refusing to bow down to them and submit to their dictates. They want to make an example out of me in order to frighten the rest of the US into silence and submission - that is, to frighten those who have not already submitted.

I am often asked, "Aren't you afraid?" Of course, but it is far scarier to do nothing.

This is not about me. This is about whether the US will stand for freedom or submit and cower before violent intimidation. They targeted me for violating sharia blasphemy laws. They mean to kill everyone who doesn't do their bidding and abide by them voluntarily.

This is a showdown for American freedom. Will we stand against this savagery, or bow down to them and silence ourselves?

This won't end with me or with the police whom Rahim and Abdul Khaliq ultimately decided to target, because the Islamic State has vowed nothing less than to destroy America. They have detailed manuals plotting full-scale insurrection and blood in the streets here. The attempt to kill me is just the beginning of their effort to force the US into subjugation.

The one thing that's being ignored that came out of Garland is that the Islamic State (ISIS) is not just coming. It's here. Islamic terrorism is here. Americans were targeted for slaughter on our home soil. Islamic terrorism is here and we are thwarting attacks on a now weekly, sometime daily, basis.

Will the media realize what's at stake, and that their heads are next, or continue to target me because they hate my message of freedom? So far, they're opting to continue to target me. I heard about the jihadist plot to behead me Wednesday evening when CNN called me for comment, citing anonymous law enforcement sources. I neither confirmed nor denied. I knew nothing.

On Thursday, Boston Police Commissioner William Evans confirmed that a knife-wielding jihadi fatally shot by terror investigators had "discussed beheading a well-known conservative blogger before changing his target to police officers."

USA Today: Evans confirmed on the Today sho w that the person Rahim had targeted was New York-based blogger Pamela Geller, an outspoken anti-Muslim activist.

So why was this the Reuters headline? "Activist says Boston beheading plot targeted her; police express doubt," Reuters. And of course the yah oos at Yahoo picked it up.

That's just a blatant lie. These people are depraved. Considering the horror, the planned savagery against an American citizen for supporting free speech, Reuters has nothing to say about the jihadists, the mosque, the ideology, the gore - instead, they just make stuff up to d emonize and smear someone fighting for freedom.

Braying for blood.

What's more, last week, before I ever heard of this plot, the FBI asked me for an urgent meeting, at which they told me that something serious was being planned. Now we know what it was.
As for Reuters, they were exposed and outed here.

Meanwhile, people see me being targeted and think, "Well, that's her business," or, "She provoked them." They don't realize that whatever happens to me, it won't stop with me. This is an attempt to force Americans into accepting Sharia blasphemy restrictions. More demands will follow. The worst thing we can do is accommodate their demands - that will only prove to them that violence and threats work. That way we will only get more violence and threats.

Why isn't the media talking about who and what is behind their holy war? The Boston mosque that Usaama Rahim attended is a terror mosque – as is the Phoenix mosque attended for ten years by the Garland jihadis Ibrahim Simpson and Nadir Soofi.

Simpson's friend Courtney Lonergan remembers him as never wavering from the teachings he learned at the mosque. "He was one of those guys who would sleep at the mosque," she recalled. "The fact that he felt personally insulted by somebody drawing a picture had to come from the ideological rhetoric coming out of the mosque."

Simpson tried to gain the respect of men in his mosque by quoting Islamic teachings word-for-word. He was featured in a 2012 video fundraiser for the mosque. And two other members of the same mosque, Hassan Abu-Jihaad and Derrick Shareef, are now in prison for jihad terror activity.

Yet the imam to these jihadis claimed he was shocked by Simpson and Soofi's jihad - that they were gentle fellows. Are we supposed to believe that they learned Peaceful Islam at the mosque but were "radicalized on the Internet"?

Again, why aren't the supposedly peaceful teachings of Islam that are supposedly taught at American mosques not able to withstand the jihadis' appeal?

This mosque ought to be investigated. The FBI should be surveilling this mosque, impounding their phone records. Was anyone from the mosque in contact with Muslim groups in Garland? Was there any communication between Phoenix and Garland?

Several surveys have shown that 80% of mosques in the U.S. teach hatred of infidels and the necessity to replace the Constitution with sharia. No one cares.

The personal costs in this fight are staggering. Please donate to our security fund because I have no intention of backing down: We have two major initiatives coming up. Donate here.

Al Qaeda's Leader In Yemen Killed In Airstrike

Nasir al Wuhayshi, who was a personal secretary to Bin Laden and had a $10m bounty on his head, is killed by a US drone.

MC HARAM

Can't touch this
STOLICHNAYA
IMPORTED PREMIUM VODKA
Stolichnaya vodka
PRODUCED FOR S.P.I. GROUP
PREMIUM VODKA

The Chronicles of Mohammed

Ibn 'Umar reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: Do not intend to observe prayer at the time of the rising of the sun nor at its setting, for it rises between the horns of Satan. Sahih Muslim

Countdown Clock



UNTIL A VILLAGE IN KENYA GETS ITS IDIOT BACK

ROCK THE HUSSY

Had a hard day beheading infidels? Not sure if video games are haram?
Relax with a Quran approved game straight from Mecca - "Rock the Hussy".

Play as a holy man and carry out the holy mission: Stone the immodest girls whilst avoiding harming the good subjugated Muslim women in burkas.
What could be more holy? May your violent God go with you.